



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.   | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| 10/070,954   | 07/22/2002  | Stephen Arkinstall   | ARKINSTALL=1          | 4903             |
| 1444   | 7590        | 01/13/2005           | EXAMINER              |                  |
| BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.<br>624 NINTH STREET, NW<br>SUITE 300<br>WASHINGTON, DC 20001-5303 |             |                      | COLEMAN, BRENDA LIBBY |                  |
|  |             |                      | ART UNIT              | PAPER NUMBER     |
|  |             |                      | 1624                  |                  |

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|                              |                                   |                         |  |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b>            | <b>Applicant(s)</b>     |  |
|                              | 10/070,954                        | ARKINSTALL ET AL.       |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b><br>Brenda Coleman | <b>Art Unit</b><br>1624 |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM  
 THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 October 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)              |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/02 &amp; 4/03</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.  |

## DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-26 are pending in the application.

### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group II in the reply filed on October 20, 2004 is acknowledged.
2. Claim 4 is withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on October 20, 2004.

### ***Specification***

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the preliminary amendment filed April 14, 2003 includes an amendment to the specification, which is not properly identified. The applicants requested that the paragraph beginning at line 1 of page 74 be amended with that which follows, however, the paragraphs are not the same. It is believed that the applicants meant to amend the paragraph starting at line 15 of page 74.

Appropriate correction is required.

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: several of the formulae in the specification are not clear, i.e. page 9, line 7 and page 10, line 3.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Priority***

5. Any non-provisional application claiming the benefit of one or more prior filed copending nonprovisional applications or international applications designating the United States of America must contain or be amended to contain in the first sentence of the specification following the title a reference to each such prior application, identifying it by application number (consisting of the series code and serial number) or international application number and international filing date and indicating the relationship of the applications. Cross-references to other related applications may be made when appropriate.

"This application is a national stage entry under 35 U.S.C. § 371 of PCT/IB00/01380, filed September 28, 2000." is suggested.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 13-20 and 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. In evaluating the enablement question, several factors are to be considered. *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546. The factors include: 1) The nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior

art, 3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence or absence of working examples, 6) the breadth of the claims, and 7) the quantity of experimentation needed.

The nature of the invention in the instant case, has claims which embrace substituted piperidines. The instant compounds of the formulae wherein the Y substituent is a piperidine ring, which forms the sulfonamide.

**HOW TO USE:** Claims 13-20 and 23-26 are to a method of treating a disease, which is associated with JNK pathway. Any evidence presented must be commensurate in scope with the claims and must clearly demonstrate the effectiveness of the claimed compounds. The scope of the method claims are not adequately enabled solely based on its inhibitory effect on JNK provided in the specification. Diseases and/or disorder(s) suspected to be associated with JNK activity include stroke, Alzheimer's and Parkinson's disease. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. It is difficult to treat many of the disorders claimed herein. Instant claim language embraces disorders not only for treatment but for **prevention** which is not remotely enabled. It is presumed in the prevention of the diseases and/or disorders claimed herein there is a way of identifying those people who may develop Alzheimer's, etc. There is no evidence of record, which would enable the skilled artisan in the identification of the people who have the potential of becoming afflicted with the disorders claimed herein.

No screening protocol(s) are ever described. Thus, no evidence of in vitro effectiveness is seen in the specification for one of the instantly claimed piperidine compounds. In general, pharmacological activity is a very unpredictable area. In cases involving physiological activity "the scope of the enablement obviously varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved." *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 166 USPQ 18 (CCPA 1970). Since this case involves unpredictable in-vivo physiological activities, the scope of the enablement given in the disclosure presented here was found to be low.

The specification has only two working examples on the use of the substituted piperidines, etc. There must be evidence to justify the contention that the claimed compounds can be useful in the treatment of "cancer, epilepsy, Alzheimer's disease, Huntington's disease, Parkinson's disease, retinal diseases, spinal cord injury, head trauma, multiple sclerosis, inflammatory bowel disease, rheumatoid arthritis, asthma, septic shock, transplant rejection, stroke, arteriosclerosis, myocardial infarction, myocardial reperfusion injury, etc."

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 1-3 and 5-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The following reasons apply:

- a) Claims 1-3 and 5-26 are vague and indefinite in that it is not known what is meant by "Derivative" which implies more than what is positively recited

b) A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claims 1, 2 and 13 recite the broad recitation X is O or S, and the claim also recites preferably O which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

c) A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim

indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claims 1, 2 and 13 recite the broad recitation n is an integer from 0 to 5, and the claim also recites preferably between 1-3 and most preferred 1 which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

- d) Claims 1 and 2 are vague and indefinite in that it is not known what is meant by the provisos at the end of the claim, which are directed to non-elected subject matter.
- e) Claim 2 is vague and indefinite in that it is not known what is meant by for use as a medicament on page 5. A statement of intended use is not given material weight. Note *In re Tuominen* 213 USPQ 89.
- f) Claim 2 is vague and indefinite in that it is not known what is meant by "substituted" on page 5.
- g) Claim 3 is vague and indefinite in that it is not known what is meant by "L<sup>2</sup>are".
- h) Claim 3 is vague and indefinite in that it is not known what is meant by the definition of L<sup>1</sup> and L<sup>2</sup>, which is not stated in the form of a proper Markush group.

- i) Claim 3 is vague and indefinite in that it is not known what is meant by the definition of R<sup>3</sup>, R<sup>3'</sup>, it is believed that the applicants intended R<sup>3</sup> "and" R<sup>3'</sup>.
- j) Claim 3 is vague and indefinite in that it is not known what is meant by the definition of R<sup>3</sup> and R<sup>3'</sup>, which is not stated in the form of a proper Markush group.
- k) Claim 3 is vague and indefinite in that it is not known what is meant by the definition of the substituents on the aryl or heteroaryl groups, which is not stated in the form of a proper Markush group.
- l) Claim 3 is vague and indefinite in that it is not known what is meant by the definition of R<sup>6</sup>, which is not stated in the form of a proper Markush group.
- m) A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481

(Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claim 3 recites the broad recitation n' is an integer from 0 to 4, and the claim also recites preferably 1 or 2 which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

- n) Claim 5 is vague and indefinite in that it is not known what is meant by the definition of Ar<sup>1</sup> and Ar<sup>2</sup>, which is not stated in the form of a proper Markush group.
- o) Claim 3 is vague and indefinite in that it is not known what is meant by the definition of substituents for the moieties of Ar<sup>1</sup> and Ar<sup>2</sup>, which is not stated in the form of a proper Markush group.
- p) A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claim 5 recites the broad recitation

optionally substituted by C<sub>1</sub>-C<sub>6</sub>-alkyl, and the claim also recites preferably trihalomethyl, which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

- q) Claim 8 recites the limitation "thioxo-dihydropyridine" in the definition of Ar<sup>1</sup>. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- r) Claim 8 is vague and indefinite in that it is not known what is meant by the definition of Ar<sup>1</sup>, which is not stated in the form of a proper Markush group.
- s) Claim 9 is vague and indefinite in that it is not known what is meant by the definitions of (R<sup>6</sup>)<sub>n</sub>, L<sup>1</sup> and L<sup>2</sup>, which are stated as being as above defined, however, they are not defined within the claim.
- t) A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claim 10 recites the broad recitation 5-

membered cyclic group containing 3 heteroatoms, and the claim also recites preferably a triazole ring, which is preferably fused with an unsubstituted or substituted aryl or heteroaryl, which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

- u) Claim 10 recites the limitation "C<sub>1</sub>-C<sub>12</sub>-alkyl" in the definition of R<sup>3</sup>. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- v) Claim 10 is vague and indefinite in that it is not known what is meant by the definition of R<sup>3</sup>, which is not stated in the form of a proper Markush group.
- w) Claim 10 is vague and indefinite in that it is not known what is meant by the definition of the aryl or heteroaryl substituents, which is not stated in the form of a proper Markush group.
- x) Claim 11 is vague and indefinite in that it is not known what is meant by the species in lines 7-8 on page 17, which is a duplicate of the species in lines 9-10 on page 13.
- y) Claim 11 is vague and indefinite in that it is not known what is meant by the species in lines 15-16 on page 19, which is a duplicate of the species in lines 13-14 on page 19.
- z) Claim 11 is vague and indefinite in that it is not known what is meant by 9H-purin-9-yl in the first three species on page 21.
- aa) Claims 13-20 and 23-26 are vague and indefinite in that the claim provides for the use of claimed compounds, but the claim does not set forth any steps involved in determining which are the disorders capable of being treated by

modulating the activity of JNK. Determining whether a given disease responds or does not respond to such an inhibitor will involve undue experimentation.

Suppose that a given drug, which has inhibitor properties in vitro, when administered to a patient with a certain disease, does not produce a favorable response. One cannot conclude that specific disease does not fall within this claim. Keep in mind that:

A. It may be that the next patient will respond. No pharmaceutical has 100% efficacy. What success rate is required to conclude our drug is a treatment? Thus, how many patients need to be treated? If "successful treatment" is what is intended, what criterion is to be used? If one person in 10 responds to a given drug, does that mean that the disease is treatable? One in 100? 1,000? 10,000? Will the standard vary depending on the current therapy for the disease?

B. It may be that the wrong dosage or dosage regimen was employed. Drugs with similar chemical structures can have markedly different pharmacokinetics and metabolic fates. It is quite common for pharmaceuticals to work and/or be safe at one dosage, but not at another that is significantly higher or lower. Furthermore, the dosage regimen may be vital --- should the drug be given e.g. once a day, or four times in divided dosages? The optimum route of administration cannot be predicted in advance. Should our drug be given as a bolus iv or in a time release po formulation. Thus, how many dosages and

dosage regimens must be tried before one is certain that our drug is not a treatment for this specific disease?

C. It may be that our specific drug, while active in vitro, simply is not potent enough or produces such low concentrations in the blood that it is not an effective treatment of the specific disease. Perhaps a structurally related drug is potent enough or produces high enough blood concentrations to treat the disease in question, so that the first drug really does fall within the claim. Thus, how many different structurally related inhibitors must be tried before one concludes that a specific compound does not fall within the claim?

D. Conversely, if the disease responds to our second drug but not to the first, both of which are inhibitors in vitro, can one really conclude that the disease falls within the claim? It may be that the first compound result is giving the accurate answer, and that the success of second compound arises from some other unknown property, which the second drug is capable. It is common for a drug, particularly in cancer, to work by many mechanisms. The history of psychopharmacology is filled with drugs, which were claimed to be a pure receptor XYX agonist or antagonist, but upon further experimentation shown to effect a variety of biological targets. In fact, the development of a drug for a specific disease and the determination of its biological site of action usually precede linking that site of action with the disease. Thus, when mixed results are obtained, how many more drugs need be tested?

E. Suppose that our drug is an effective treatment of the disease of interest, but only when combined with some totally different drug. There are for example, agents in antiviral and anticancer chemotherapy, which are not themselves effective, but are effective treatments when the agents are combined with something else.

Consequently, determining the true scope of the claim will involve extensive and potentially inconclusive research. Without it, one skilled in the art cannot determine the actual scope of the claim. Hence, the claim is indefinite.

- ab) Claims 16-19 are vague and indefinite in that it is not known what is meant by "according to said formula I" where formula I is not present in the claim.
- ac) Claim 21 is vague and indefinite in that it is not known what is meant by a' in the third line of the claim.
- ad) Claim 21 is vague and indefinite in that it is not known what is meant by the definitions of  $(R^6)_n$ ,  $L^1$  and  $L^2$ , which are stated as being as above defined, however, they are not defined within the claim.
- ae) Claim 22 is vague and indefinite in that it is not known what is meant by the definitions of  $Ar^2$  and  $R^1$ , which are stated as being as above defined, however, they are not defined within the claim.
- af) Claim 22 is vague and indefinite in that it is not known what is meant by the definitions of  $Ar^1$ , which are stated as being as above defined, however, they are not defined within the claim.

***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

8. Claims 1-3 and 5-26 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-19 of copending Application No. 10/381,197. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the compounds, compositions, process of preparing and method of use of the compounds of formula I of the instant invention and the compounds, compositions, process of preparing and method of use of the compounds of formula I of 10/381,197 embrace the same subject matter where Ar<sup>2</sup> of the instant invention is phenyl.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

9. Claims 1-3 and 5-26 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-16 of copending Application No. 10/381,200. Although the conflicting claims are not

identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the compounds, compositions, process of preparing and method of use of the compounds of formula I of the instant invention and the compounds, compositions, process of preparing and method of use of the compounds of formula I of 10/381,200 embrace the same subject matter.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

10. Claims 1-3 and 5-26 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-19 of copending Application No. 10/381,665. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the compounds, compositions, process of preparing and method of use of the compounds of formula I of the instant invention and the compounds, compositions, process of preparing and method of use of the compounds of formula I of 10/381,665 embrace the same subject matter.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brenda Coleman whose telephone number is 571-272-0665. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James O. Wilson can be reached on 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*Brenda Coleman*  
Brenda Coleman  
Primary Examiner Art Unit 1624  
January 10, 2005